



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/653,614	08/31/2000	Gregory L. Slaughter	5181-67400	4149

7590

12/02/2004

Robert C Kowert  
Conley Rose & Tayon PC  
P O Box 398  
Austin, TX 78767-0398

EXAMINER
----------

NGUYEN, VAN H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2126

DATE MAILED: 12/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/653,614	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SLAUGHTER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> VAN H NGUYEN	<b>Art Unit</b> 2126	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 July 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL.      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4,5,7-14,16-27,29,30 and 32-50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-2, 4-5, 7-14, 16-27, 29-30, and 32-50 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-14, 16-27, 29-30, and 32-50 are presented for examination.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

3. Claims 39-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Pulliam et al.** (U.S. 6,609,108).

4. **As to claims 39:**

Pulliam teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a method comprising:

- a. storing a set of information in a space by sending at least one message specified in a schema for the space (*col. 3, lines 52-67; col. 7, lines 46-54; and col. 13, lines 19-67*), wherein the set of information is expressed in a data representation language (*col. 7, lines 46-col. 8, line 5*), and wherein the space is addressable at a Uniform Resource Identifier (*col. 7, lines 46-64*);
- b. a client locating the space at the URI (*col. 7, lines 46-64 and col. 9, lines 35-47*);
- c. the client retrieving the set of information expressed in the data representation language from the space by sending at least one of the message specified in the

schema for the space (*col.3, lines 52-col.4, line 10; col.13, lines 19-67; and col.16, lines 6-12*).

- d. While teaching *a communication schema and messages*, Pulliam does not specifically teach “the schema specifies a plurality of messages usable to invoke functions of the space.”
- e. It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Pulliam for “*the schema specifies a plurality of messages usable to invoke functions of the space*” in order to provide a means for efficiently delivering the desired service to the customer, and minimizing the risk that the customer will become inconvenienced and dissatisfied with the merchant’s on-line ordering services.
- f. The fact that Pulliam’s teachings “*an online communication schema for communicating online vehicle orders is provided - The communication schema includes a customer request message, which includes an order message having order information, contact information and vehicle configuration - The order message includes a fleet order message, a retail order message, and a tagged order message. The communication schema further includes a lead message having lead information, contact information, vehicle configuration, and dealer information. The communication schema further includes an order confirmation message.*” (col. 3, lines 29-39), and “*The communication schema includes a customer request message, which includes an order message having order information, contact information and vehicle configuration*” in Pulliam suggest

*“the schema specifies a plurality of messages usable to invoke functions of the space.”*

5. **As to claim 40:**

Pulliam teaches the data representation language comprises eXtensible Markup Language (*col.7, lines 46-58; col.13, lines 22, 42; and col.16, lines 6-12*).

6. **As to claim 41:**

Pulliam teaches the space comprises one or more web pages which are viewable by a web browser (*col.7, lines 46-51*).

7. **As to claim 42:**

Pulliam teaches the schema is expressed in a data representation language (*col.7, lines 46-61*).

8. **As to claims 43-46:**

Note the rejection of claims 39-42 above. Claims 43-46 are the same as claims 39-42, except claims 43-46 are system claims and claims 39-42 are method claims.

9. **As to claims 47-50:**

Note the rejection of claims 39-42 above. Claims 47-50 are the same as claims 39-42, except claims 47-50 are carrier medium claims and claims 39-42 are method claims.

10. Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-14, 16-27, 29-30, and 32-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Pulliam et al.** in view of **Guyot et al.** (U.S. 6,119,098).

11. **As to claim 1:**

Art Unit: 2126

- a. The rejection of claim 39 above is incorporated herein in full. Claim 1, however, further recites “the space service is operable to store one or more service advertisements and each of the service advertisements comprises information which is usable to access a corresponding service.”
- b. Pulliam discloses the space service, but is silent on “the space service is operable to store one or more service advertisements and each of the service advertisements comprises information which is usable to access a corresponding service.”
- c. Guyot teaches the space service is operable to store one or more service advertisements and each of the service advertisements comprises information which is usable to access a corresponding service (*col. 3, line 23-col. 4, line 14*).
- d. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Guyot and Pulliam because Guyot’s teaching would have provided the capability for efficiently distributing the targeted advertisements to the subscribers over the distributed information network.

12. **As to claim 2:**

Pulliam teaches the client sending messages to the space service at a Uniform Resource Identifier (*col. 7, lines 46-64 and col. 9, lines 35-47*).

13. **As to claim 4:**

Pulliam teaches the schema is expressed in a data representation language (*col. 7, lines 46-61*).

Art Unit: 2126

14. **As to claim 5:**

Pulliam teaches the data representation language comprises eXtensible Markup Language (*col. 7, lines 46-58; col. 13, lines 22, 42; and col. 16, lines 6-12*).

15. **As to claim 7:**

Pulliam teaches the client accessing the space service comprises the client sending at least one of the messages specified in the schema to the space service (*col. 3, lines 52-67; col. 7, lines 46-54; and col. 13, lines 19-67*).

16. **As to claim 8:**

- a. Pulliam teaches the client searching the one or more services stored in the space (*col. 13, lines 20-42*).
- b. Pulliam, however, is silent on “the services are the service advertisements.”
- c. Guyot teaches the one or more service advertisements (*col. 3, line 23-col. 4, line 14*).
- d. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Guyot and Pulliam because Guyot’s teaching would have provided the capability for efficiently distributing the targeted advertisements to the subscribers over the distributed information network.

17. **As to claim 9:**

- a. Pulliam teaches each of the one or more services comprise a URI at which the corresponding service may be accessed (*col. 16, lines 4-12*).

Art Unit: 2126

- b. Pulliam does not explicitly teach the services are service advertisements and a schema which specifies messages usable to invoke functions of the corresponding service.
- c. Note the discussion of claim 8 above for rejection of “the services are service advertisements” and the discussion of claim 39 above for rejection of “a schema which specifies messages usable to invoke functions of the corresponding service.”

**18. As to claims 10-11:**

They include the same limitations as claims 4-5 above, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

**19. As to claim 12:**

- a. Pulliam teaches generating results in response client to the executing the corresponding service for the selected service for the client; and publishing the results in a network-addressable location (*col.13, lines 20-67 and col.16, lines 4-12*).
- b. Pulliam, however, is silent on “the selected service is the selected service advertisement and information usable to access the network-addressable location is provided in an advertisement for the network addressable-location.”
- c. Guyot teaches the selected service is the selected service advertisement and information usable to access the network-addressable location is provided in an advertisement for the network addressable-location (*col.3, line 23-col.4, line 14*).



Art Unit: 2126

- d. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Guyot and Pulliam because Guyot's teaching would have provided the capability for efficiently distributing the targeted advertisements to the subscribers over the distributed information network.

20. **As to claim 13:**

- a. Pulliam does not explicitly teach the client sending an instantiation request to the space after the selecting one of the service advertisements from the space; obtaining a lease for the corresponding service for the selected service advertisement; sending the lease and the selected service advertisement to the client; and constructing a gate for the client to access the corresponding service.
- b. Guyot teaches the client sending an instantiation request to the space after the selecting one of the service advertisements from the space; obtaining a lease for the corresponding service for the selected service advertisement; sending the lease and the selected service advertisement to the client; and constructing a gate for the client to access the corresponding service (*figs. 6(A) and 6(B) and associated text*).
- c. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Guyot and Pulliam because Guyot's teaching would have provided the capability for efficiently distributing the targeted advertisements to the subscribers over the distributed information network.

Art Unit: 2126

**21. As to claims 14, 16-18, 20-25:**

Note the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-5, and 8-13 above. Claims 14, 16-18, 20-25 are the same as claims 1, 2, 4-5, and 8-13, except claims 14, 16-18, 20-25 are system claims and claims 1, 2, 4-5, and 8-13 are method claims.

**22. As to claim 19:**

Note the discussion of claim 9 above for rejection of rejection of “the schema specifies messages usable to read advertisements from the space service and publish advertisements in the space service.”

**23. As to claims 26-27, 29-30 and 32-38:**

Note the rejection of claims 1-2, 4-5, and 7-13 above. Claims 26-27, 29-30 and 32-38 are the same as claims 1-2, 4-5, and 7-13, except claims 26-27, 29-30 and 32-38 are carrier medium claims and claims 1-2, 4-5, and 7-13 are method claims.

***Response to Arguments***

24. Applicant's arguments filed July 14<sup>th</sup>, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

25. It is noted that in the response filed July 14<sup>th</sup>, 2004 Applicant stated that “response to final action of April 21<sup>st</sup>, 2004” (page 1); and that “Therefore claims 1-50 remain pending in the application. (page 2)” However, the office action mailed April 21<sup>st</sup>, 2004 was the non-final rejection; and only claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-14, 16-27, 29-30, and 32-50 are pending

in the application. Claims 3, 6, 15, 28, and 31 have been previously cancelled by Applicant.

26. In the remarks, Applicant argued in substance that: (1) "Pulliam teaches nothing regarding storing a set of information in a space by sending at least one message specified in a schema for the space"; (2) "Pulliam also fails to teach wherein the set of information stored in the space is expresses in a data presentation language"; (3) "Pulliam does not teach or suggest a schema specifying a plurality of messages usable to invoke functions of the space." and (4) Guyot fails to teach wherein the space service is operable to store one or more service advertisements and each of the service advertisements comprise information which is usable to access a corresponding service.
27. Examiner respectfully traverses Applicant's remarks:
- a. As to point (1), despite Applicant's assertions, Pulliam does teach the use of a communication schema, and messages including information are sent and stored (*col.3, lines 52-67; col.7, lines 46-54; and col.13, lines 19-67*). The term "a space" is very wide in scope and clarification is required. Applicant employs broad language which includes the use of words and phrases which have broad meanings in the art. In addition, Applicant has not argued any narrower interpretation of the claim language, nor amended the claims significantly enough to construe a narrower meaning to the limitations. As the claims breadth allows multiple interpretations and meanings which are broader than Applicant's disclosure, the Examiner is forced to interpret the

claim limitations as broadly as reasonably possible, in determining patentability of the disclosed invention.

- b. As to point (2), Pulliam does teach the set of information stored in the space is expresses in a data presentation language (*e.g., using hypertext markup language, extensible markup language; col.7, lines 46-col.8, line 5*).
- c. As to point (3), Pulliam's teachings "*an online communication schema for communicating online vehicle orders is provided - The communication schema includes a customer request message, which includes an order message having order information, contact information and vehicle configuration - The order message includes a fleet order message, a retail order message, and a tagged order message. The communication schema further includes a lead message having lead information, contact information, vehicle configuration, and dealer information. The communication schema further includes an order confirmation message.*" (col. 3, lines 29-39) does suggest "a schema specifying a plurality of messages usable to invoke functions of the space" as claimed by Applicant.

Applicant has had opportunities to amend the claimed subject matter, and has failed to modify the claim language to distinguish over the prior art of record by clarifying or substantially narrowing the claim language. Thus, Applicant apparently intends that a broad interpretation be given to the claims and the Examiner has adopted such in the present and previous Office action rejections. See *In re Prater and Wei*, 162 USPQ 541 (CCPA 1969), and MPEP § 2111.

Art Unit: 2126

- d. As to point (3), Pulliam's teachings "the server stores and manage an advertisement...display the targeted advertisements" (col.3, lines 23-30) do read-on the claimed limitations.

***Conclusion***

28. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).
29. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.
30. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VAN H. NGUYEN whose telephone number is (571) 272-3765. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30AM - 6:00PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternative Friday.
31. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756.
32. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2126

33. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**


Commissioner for patents

P O Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

11/26/04

vhv



MENG-AL T. AN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100